

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--|
| 10/681,719 | 10/07/2003 | John M. Boyd | LAM2P311A | LAM2P311A 6699 | |
| 7590 05/13/2005 | | EXAMINER | | | |
| Michael L. Gencarella, Esq. | | | OJINI, EZIAMARA ANTHONY | | |
| Martin & Penill Suite 170 | a, LLP | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| 710 Lakeway Drive | | | 3723 | | |
| Sunnyvale, CA 94085 | | | DATE MAILED: 05/13/2005 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| • | · | | | SV | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--------|--|--|--|
| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| | | 10/681,719 | BOYD ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Anthony Ojini | 3723 | | | | |
| | e MAILING DATE of this communication ap | pears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | |
| Period for Re | • • | VIC CET TO EVOIDE 2 MONTH | (C) EDOM | | | | |
| THE MAIL - Extensions after SIX (6 - If the period - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re | ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL. ING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repd for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period epply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut seceived by the Office later than three months after the mailing ent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communic (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133). | ation. | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1)⊠ Res | ponsive to communication(s) filed on 22 A | April 2005. | | | | | |
| 2a)☐ This | action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This | s action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3)☐ Sind | e this application is in condition for allowa | ince except for formal matters, pro | secution as to the merit | s is | | | |
| clos | ed in accordance with the practice under | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45 | 53 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| Disposition o | of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Clai | m(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application | 1. | | | | | |
| 4a) (| Of the above claim(s) <u>11-16</u> is/are withdra | wn from consideration. | | | | | |
| 5)∐ Clai | m(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| = | m(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| · | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8)⊡ Clai | m(s) are subject to restriction and/o | or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application F | Papers | | | | | | |
| 9)⊠ The | specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The | 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 October 2003</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Appl | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Rep | lacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob | jected to. See 37 CFR 1.12 | 21(d). | | | |
| 11) <u></u> The | oath or declaration is objected to by the E | xaminer. Note the attached Office | Action or form PTO-152 | 2. | | | |
| Priority unde | r 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| 12) Ackr | nowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr | n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) |)-(d) or (f). | | | | |
| a)∐ Ai | a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. | Certified copies of the priority document | ts have been received. | | | | | |
| 2. | Certified copies of the priority document | ts have been received in Applicati | on No | | | | |
| 3. | Copies of the certified copies of the price | ority documents have been receive | ed in this National Stage | ; | | | |
| | application from the International Burea | u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | |
| * See ti | he attached detailed Office action for a list | of the certified copies not receive | ;d. | | | | |
| A44-ab | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary | (PTO-413) | | | | |
| | Praftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Da | ate | | | | |
| 3) Information | n Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 |) 5) Notice of Informal P | Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of group I, claims 1-10 in the reply filed on 4/22/05 is acknowledged. Claims 11-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 4/22/05.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,656,024. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the application claims are merely broader than the patent claims. Thus, the patent claims anticipate the application claims.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Apparatus for reducing compressed dry air usage during chemical mechanical planarization.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meyer et al. (5,722,877).

With respect to claim 1, Meyer et al. disclose a chemical mechanical planarization system, comprising: a polishing surface (15); and a platen (22) disposed along an underside of the polishing surface; and a retaining ring (40) surrounding the platen.

With respect to claim 3, Meyer et al. disclose wherein the polishing surface is a belt (see fig. 7).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2, 4-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 3723

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Owczarz et al., de la Llera et al., Shih and Shendon disclose polishing apparatus having a platen disposed along an underside of the polishing surface respectively.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Ojini whose telephone number is 571 272 4492. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 to 4 Tuesday-Friday with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail can be reached on 571 272 4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AO 5/6/05 Appin